

Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #938
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Mon, 27 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 938

Today's Topics:

Info required on BC-312 or 342 radio
My backyard, your backyard ...
PRO-57 MODS
removing "coaxseal"
The "right to receive"
The End of Amateur Radio {3/3}
Tiltover vs. Crankup Towers.

Date: 27 Nov 89 14:00:40 GMT
From: mcsun!ukc!axion!news@uunet.uu.net (John Foster)
Subject: Info required on BC-312 or 342 radio

I'm posting this for a friend who doesn't have access to the net. He is Mark Evans (G0Kfv), and he needs some information in order to restore a BC-312 (or it might be a BC-342).

The radio comes from RCA, Hollywood, CA and was made in 1944. Mark believes it was originally mounted in a Liberator bomber on duties overseeing North Atlantic convoys in 1945.

The PA stage is operational, and all valves are present and test OK. The big problem is that the dynamotor has been removed at some point, leaving a collection of loose wires in the region of the VFO. Mark needs the relevant part of the circuit diagram, and would appreciate hearing from anyone who has it or knows where he could locate it. He'd also like to know how to recognise a suitable dynamotor, or failing that, what the spec is for its power output so that he can build an alternative supply.

Any useful info would be gratefully received, including further historical details. Serial numbers etc can be provided if required. I'll pass on any EMAILs received, or Mark can be reached at: 16, Rosabelle Ave, Wivenhoe, Colchester CO7 9NX, UK.

Thanks in advance for any help.

John Foster, RT3151, Room G44C, SSTF, British Telecom Research Labs,
Martlesham Heath, Ipswich, IP5 7RE, UK.
Phone: +44 473 646019 Fax: +44 473 643019 Telex: 987137

Date: 27 Nov 89 18:14:10 GMT
From: usc!samsung!emory!stiatl!rsiatl!jgd@ucsd.edu (John G. De Armond)
Subject: My backyard, your backyard ...

In article <2942@cpoint.UUCP> die@cpoint.UUCP (David I. Emery) writes:

> And if I do not have a fundamental right to demodulate what shows
>up in my backyard, then why is it not perfectly appropriate for Congress
>to define certain essentially private communications as restricted in the
>same sense as pay-for-reception transmissions are ? Is there some important
>difference between assuring that the provider of a signal gets his fee and
>and protecting the privacy of personal communications from casual
>eavesdropping ?
>
> Why, in short, should I have a right to listen to your phone calls but
>not watch HBO's video ?
>
> And the fact HBO uses DES to make it slightly harder for me
>to interpret their signal (because they use DES sloppily, not because it
>isn't potentially effective) should or shouldn't make a difference in whether
>I can watch it ? In other words if I can break encryption, can I use the
>fruits thereof - does my "absolute right" to interpret energy in my yard
>extend to even those communications protected by encryption if weak
>enough so it can be broken ?
>

YES I do have a fundamental right, if not in current law, then in principle, to receive ANYTHING that makes it to my property.

Until very recently, it was a recognized principle of law that personal rights, especially personal rights that do not affect others, were inalienable. This was exemplified by the concept of "fair use" for example. Fair use says that the individual may use intellectual property for his own private purposes without license or control. This concept is further illustrated by the language in the Comm Act of 34 which established the unfettered right to receive any signal provided certain restrictions on its use were observed. This very sensible language preserved both the rights of the private individual and the rights of the owner of the information transmitted.

The law said basicly that one could receive any signal as long as the information is not disclosed and is for personal use. (Simplified interpretation.)

Under this language, I could receive:

The police

Land mobile transmissions,
Marine radio transmissions,
Satellite transmissions,
any other electromagnetic radiation that penetrated my property.

I could not:
reveal it to another person,
Use it for personal gain,
Interfer with the transmission.

Unfortunately as of late, two concepts have flourished in government circles. One is that "collective interests" are more important than individual rights and must be served at the expense of these rights. One only has to look at the things the government does "in the public interest" or "for Society's benefit" to see this point illustrated.

The other concept is that it is intrinsically wrong to have fun. Especially if that fun is different from yours. Some people who disagree with the concept of scanner monitoring as "Voyeurism." As one who enjoys several somewhat socially unacceptable hobbies (shooting, motorcycling, ham radio, computers), I've seen my share of this effect. I used to attribute it to other causes such as snobism but I realized awhile back that the root cause is that many people just hate to see others have fun!

Then, of course, we have to take into consideration the propensity of the government to sell resources to the highest bidder.

We've so far allowed the HBO types and the Cellular industry get away with one public resource grab. The question is will we let it continue? I hope not. I hope the ECPA will get the proper constitutional challenge and that it succeeds. If not, a logical conclusion to this process could be that one day any "unauthorized" reception of electromagnetic radiation - including that which we call light - will be banned unless specifically designated as legal. Think about that one for a minute.

John

--
John De Armond, WD40QC | Manual? ... What manual ?!
Radiation Systems, Inc. Atlanta, GA | This is Unix, My son, You
emory!rsiatl!jgd **I am the NRA** | just GOTTA Know!!!

Date: 27 Nov 89 06:22:24 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!usc!sdsu!ucselx!sunstroke.sdsu.edu!amagnet@apple.com

(Andrew Magnet)
Subject: PRO-57 MODS

I am interested in MODS for the RS PRO-57 scanner.
I couldn't find any that were currently available via ftp.

I am interested in expanding memories and extending range.

If anyone has experimented with it, let me know.

Andy Magnet (N60SR)
amagnet@sunstroke.sdsu.edu

Date: 27 Nov 89 14:27:32 GMT
From: philmtl!philabs!briar.philips.com!rfc@uunet.uu.net (Robert
Casey;6282;3.57;\$0201)
Subject: removing "coaxseal"

copied from packet:

Msg#	TSF	Size	#Rd	Date/Time	MsgID	From	To
9859	BF	560	4	1125/1554	10759_WA2SNA	WM8J	ALL@LOCAL
Sb: COAX SEAL REMOVAL							

I'VE FOUND A GOOD WAY TO REMOVE THE PRODUCT CALLED "COAX SEAL" FROM
CONNECTORS. THE PRODUCT "LIQUID WRENCH" DISSOLVES COAX SEAL
NICELY, ESPECIALLY IF YOU USE A TOOTH BRUSH TO SCRUB THE
CONNECTOR.

73 de WA2ISE
=====

communism sucks

Date: 27 Nov 89 18:00:40 GMT
From: att!cbnewsm!mhgki!rma@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (atkins, robert m)
Subject: The "right to receive"

In article <6557@lynx.UUCP>, neal@lynx.uucp (Neal Woodall) writes:
> In article <6968@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:
>
> >If it is illegal to wiretap phones, then why should it not be illegal to
> >"airtap" cellular phones.
>
> First of all, to tap into a phone, you must somehow gain unauthorized

> access to the property of the phone company. This is a victimization
> because it is a trespassing. Now, the hypothetical "airtap" that you
> suggest is just a simple reception of signals that are passing through
> your home and body....you don't need to trespass on anyone else's
> property to get the signal, you simply turn on a radio and tune in the
> desired frequency. No victimization, no crime committed.....
>

Neal,

phonetapping is not a crime because it requires trespassing on phone company property. Even if the police had phone company permission to access their property , phonetapping is still illegal without a court order. Could the phone company transcribe all your phone calls and publish them? Its their property so can they do what they want? The "crime" is invasion of privacy. If I use a telescope to peek into my neighbours bedroom and videotape all I see, is that OK as long as I don't sell the tape? To be a "victim" does not require property loss or damage.

Let me say that I am all for freedom of speech and action, where it does not interfere with my right to privacy. You can say whatever you want to - I don't have to listen. But when you listen in to my phone calls, where is my right to privacy? Could you, or "the authorities" listen in to my cellular phone calls and use whatever was heard as evidence in court, without prior court permission? Now where is the "police state".

Isn't the right to privacy often cited as a constitutional right? Do I have to scramble all my phone calls to achieve this, or should interception of conversations intended to be private, be a violation of the law?

(By the way, whatever happened to amateur radio on this newsgroup??)

Bob Atkins, KA1GT

Date: 27 Nov 89 18:13:05 GMT

From: att!cbnewsm!mhgki!rma@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (atkins, robert m)
Subject: The End of Amateur Radio {3/3}

Paul,

Whatever anyone else thinks, I like your postings. I do not see them as "doom and gloom", but a reasoned account of a possible future. We should all take a close look at what you have said, much of which I think is true. Hams in general have an overinflated ego when it comes to their own importance and their "rights". If we did not already have the spectrum allocations we have on historical grounds, I think we would have a hard time justifying our getting them. We need to think long and hard about how ham radio will evolve into the next century, and I think your postings have given much food for thought.

Thanks, Bob Atkins KA1GT

Date: 27 Nov 89 17:10:52 GMT
From: hpl-opus!hpspdra!henryb@hplabs.hp.com (Henry Black)
Subject: Tiltover vs. Crankup Towers.

I'm currently seeking permits and in the market for a 50ft or so tower. I've already decided on galvanised steel (rather than Al.), but being unkeen on the prospect of tower climbing, I'm thinking of either a tiltover or a crankup (telescoping?) tower. So questions:

1. Do all types of (triangular section) tower have to be climbed when erecting them, even if they later tiltover etc..
2. What are the pros and cons of tiltover vs. telescoping.
3. Any other good alternatives for 50ft.

Henry Black G4NOC/W6 415 857 6655

Date: Mon, 27 Nov 89 15:51:07 EST
From: "Mike Jordan G4ASQ" <JORDAN@LL.LL.MIT.EDU>

Sorry to spend the bandwidth on this, but to set the record straight on U.K. politics.

>England seems to have many laws that classify it as a police state:
>No right of free speech,

Nonsense. With the caveat below, relating to political ads, you can say what you like, when you like, and to whom you like.

>very restrictive gun laws,

True, thank goodness - and a murder rate a fraction of the U.S. as a result.

>an oppressive "Big Brother"-type government,

Where did you get this? If Thatcher were any more in agreement with Reagan she'd have divorced Denis & married him.. She even got him a knighthood! (given by the queen, but put forward by the P.M.)

>high taxes.....

Last time I was in a position to notice, the standard rate of tax in the U.K. was around 30%. I'm currently paying 28% Fed + 7% FICA + 6% State = 41%. There is a higher U.K. rate for top earners, there is also a 33% Federal rate in the U.S. .

>and now I find out this: you cannot even listen to radio waves

>passing through your own body!

Actually, I agree with you on this one, unfortunately it seems that the U.S. is going the same way.

Re Greenpeace:

This probably ran afoul of the paid political ad laws. Here in the U.S., the 'speech' of political ads is NOT 'free' - its bought & paid for. This means that the party with the most money gets the most T.V. time, and gets the attention of the masses, & presumably their votes. In England, TV political ads ARE free - i.e. the broadcasters have to give free time for political ads, and every party gets their share - even the loonies on left & right. A fairer system IMHO. It means you have to be fairly strict about what constitutes a political ad, or everyone else would cry foul...

I now return to the regularly scheduled discussion of shoplifting, pizza, BARF, gun laws, free speech, and, maybe, ham radio.....

Mike G4ASQ / KC1?? - soon I hope

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #938
